UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,117	02/22/2006	Richard L. Miller	58751US010	2906

32692 7590 06/24/2010

3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY
PO BOX 33427
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER	
BAEK, BONG-SOOK	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1614	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/24/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com
LegalDocketing@mmm.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/595,117	MILLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BONG-SOOK BAEK	1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 March 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,11,14,17,20-22,27,34 and 36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *5 and 6* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20-22, 27, 34 and 36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of claims

The amendment filed on March 30, 2010 is acknowledged. Claims 1-8, 11, 14, 17, 20-22, 27, 34, and 36 are pending.

Applicants' arguments, filed on December 3, 2008, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application. Responses are limited to Applicants' arguments relevant to either reiterated or newly applied rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20-22, 27, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0058674 in view of WO 99/29693 in further view of US patent 6,328,991).

US 2002/0058674 teaches method/system for treating condition associated with a mucosal surface, the system comprising an immune response modifier (IRM) compound chosen from imidazoquinoline amines, imidazopyridine amines, 6,7-fused cycloalkylimidazopyridine amines, imidazonaphthyridine amines, oxazoloquinoline amines, thiazoloquinoline amines, 1,2-bridged imidazoquinoline amines, and pharmaceutically acceptable salts thereof and an applicator device for applying the IRM compound to the mucosal surface, wherein this system of IRM compounds and applicator is used to treat conditions associated with mucosal surfaces such as cervical dysphasia and cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (abstract). The reference further discloses the structure of imidazonaphthyridine amines of formula X, which embraces the elected compound and the disclosure of WO99/29693, which teaches the same imidazonaphthyridine amines structure as the formula X and the elected compound, is incorporated by reference ([0004] and [0179]-[0246]). It discloses the use of imiquimod in their example formulation Table 1 [0351] and Table 2 [0354]. However, the language comprising in their claim 1 enables one skilled in the art to use any immune response modulators listed in the disclosure for the same purpose and particularly advantageous for topical application to the cervix for treatment of cervical conditions such as cervical dysplasias including dysplasia associated with human papillomavirus (HPV) ([0002]).

US 2002/0058674 further teaches that IRM can be formulated as a suppository and administered intravaginally using a suppository applicator [0343] or IRM can be topically applied to the cervical mucosa by using a direct cervical applicator, as previously described or using a cervical cap ([0334]). This reads on instant claim 2 because it uses the same device to apply and when the device is removed after use it is removed from the same device. The reference further teaches that the applicator device is prefilled with a therapeutically effective amount of the IRM compound (claim 26), which reads on the limitation "the IRM is predispersed within a solid matrix capable of releasing the IRM" recited in the instant claim 34. US 2002/0058674 teaches that single dose, randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled dose escalation study which evaluated five doses of imiquimod. 50, 100, 150, 200 and 250 mg of imiquimod in a cream formulation were applied to the cervix for eight hours ([0348]). '674 further teaches that although some of the beneficial effects of IRMs are known, the ability to provide therapeutic benefit via topical application of an IRM for treatment of a particular condition at a particular location may be hindered due to tissue irritation, formulation wash away, poor permeation or undesired systemic delivery of the topically applied compound. Accordingly, there is a need for new methods, formulations, and systems to provide the greatest therapeutic benefit from this class of compounds ([0007]). This explains the limitation of claim 1 that the method of treatment should achieve immuno modulation with reduced irritation, and the disposable tampon's and cervical cup explained above.

US 2002/0058674 also teaches topical administration of a pharmacological agent to a tissue surface can provide localized therapeutic benefit without concomitant systemic effects. However, topical application is often difficult or impossible due to the anatomical location of

the tissue. In some cases, application of the agent to a general anatomical region that includes or surrounds the target tissue may be an alternative to direct topical application. But, if the agent has irritating properties, this alternative disadvantageously carries with it the possibility of irritating tissues surrounding the target tissue. In addition, even if the agent is non-irritating, regional application typically requires use of a greater volume or concentration of the agent to achieve a therapeutic result equivalent to that achieved by direct application to the target tissue ([0008]).

US 2002/0058674 further teaches that the uterine cervix is one example of a target tissue to which it is difficult to apply a topical agent. Relative to a standing position, the cervix is typically located at the uppermost portion of the vaginal cavity. However, while the cervix is located at the uppermost portion of the vaginal cavity, age, the stage of the estrous cycle, pregnancy, and other factors cause variability of the location of the cervix between different women and in the same woman at different stages of life ([0009]). In addition, with the exception of certain body orientations, gravity tends to drain agents away from the cervix. Normal discharge and flow of fluids, both menstrual and non-menstrual, also drain away from the cervix. Thus, any applicator that is not capable of repeatedly delivering an appropriate amount of agent to the uppermost end of the vaginal cavity risks less than optimal treatment ([0011]). Although '674 does not teach the removal of the device after two hours as in instant claim 11, one skilled in the art would have reasoned that the use of cervical cap or other applicators depending on the state of life of the women's body it can be removed and inserted within this time period.

'674 does not specifically disclose 1-(2-methylpropyl)-lH- imidazo [4,5-c] [1,5]naphthyridin-4-amine, the elected specie of the current invention although the generic imidazonaphthyridine amines disclosed in the reference encompasses the elected species. Also, it is silent about "removing at least 50% by weight of the IRM that was originally applied at a time before it would otherwise be naturally absorbed or eliminated" and "activating a TLR such as TRL-7".

WO 99/29693 teaches that 1-(2-methylpropyl)-lH- imidazo [4,5-c] [1,5] naphthyridin-4-amine, which is a species of imidazonaphthyridine compounds of the same formula as disclosed in '674 reference, has immune response modifying effects and is useful for treating viral diseases and tumors such as cervical intraepithelial neoplasia and human papillomavirus and associated neoplasia (claim 1, p47, example 30, and p26, lines 3-20, lines 3, p36, lines 14-19, and claims 1-7).

US patent 6,328,991 teaches a removable vaginal device such as vaginal sponge impregnated with a solution containing a carrier and an active pharmaceutical agent for vaginal infections, which releases active agents throughout the vaginal canal while being inserted and is removed (abstract, column 4, lines 40-57, and column 6, lines 1-64). US 4393871 also teaches a vaginal device adapted for insertion and placement in the human vaginal cavity and subsequent removal therefrom for the administration of a variety of medications such as anti-infectives, anti-inflammatories, estrogens, progestogens, and the like (abstract). It also teaches that the amount of active agent incorporated in the vaginal device of the present invention varies, depending on the particular active agent, and the desired therapeutic or prophylactic therapy and the upper limit and the lower limit will depend on the activity of the active agent and the time span of its

release from the device. It further teaches that the concentration of active pharmaceutical in such excess amount represents the desired concentration in the dosage to be released and the amount of excess liquid is dependent upon the molecular weight of the active and the nature of the active, e.g. its molecular weight. In addition, it teaches that the lower the molecular weight, the less liquid is required. The more compatible the molecular structure of the active with the vaginal tissue, the less active is required.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the elected compound 1-(2-methylpropyl)-lH- imidazo [4,5-c] [1,5] naphthyridin-4-amine for the method of '674 since '674 already discloses imidazonaphthyridine amines derivatives encompassing the elected compound and WO 99/29693 teaches that 1-(2-methylpropyl)-lH-imidazo [4,5-c] [1,5] naphthyridin-4-amine is a species of imidazonaphthyridine derivatives, which is useful for treating viral diseases and tumors such as cervical intraepithelial neoplasia and human papillomavirus and associated neoplasia. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the elected compound from the genus in the reference, since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole because the skilled chemist would have the reasonable expectation that any of the species of the genus would have similar properties and thus, the same use as taught for the genus as a whole i.e., as IRM compound for treating cervical dysplasia by applying it locally with either suppository or cervical cap as taught by '674.

With regard to "activating a TLR such as TRL-7", it would be expected features since the reference teaches the same compound as the elected species. It is noted that products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. A chemical composition and

its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches the identical chemical structure, the properties applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). When the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, a prima facie case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). Alternately, the discovery of a previously unappreciated property of a prior art composition, or of a scientific explanation for the prior art's functioning, does not render the old composition patentably new to the discoverer. See Atlas Powder Co. v. Ireco Inc., 190 F.3d 1342, 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1943, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Thus the claiming of a new use, new function or unknown property which is inherently present in the prior art does not necessarily make the claim patentable. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1254, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).

With regard to "removing at least 50% by weight of the IRM that was originally applied at a time before it would otherwise be naturally absorbed or eliminated" and "removing 2 hours or less after it is applied", the use of removable cervical devices for delivering an IRM drug to a mucosal surface within vagina would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made as taught by the cited references and one skilled in the art would have known that the device could be removed after insertion within a certain time period and the substantial amount of the drug applied to the device, which is not absorbed by mucosal surface, would be removed along with the device. Furthermore, the cited references teach that excess amount of an active compound is usually applied to the applicator for achieving the desired concentration to be released and the amount of excess liquid is dependent upon the desired

therapeutic or prophylactic therapy and the molecular weight of the active and the nature of the active, e.g. its molecular weight. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to remove the excess amount by taking out the device in order to avoid overdosing or other side effects such as irritation. The amount removed and the duration of application will be adjusted based on the particular active agent and the desired therapeutic or prophylactic therapy. Thus, absent some demonstration of unexpected results from the claimed parameters, the optimization of the duration of period and the amount removed would have been obvious at the time of applicant's invention.

Response to Applicant's arguments

Applicants argued that none of references disclose that IRM compounds provide continued immune enhancement even after removal from contact. In response to this argument, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., providing continued immune enhancement even after removal from contact) are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, some of the IRM compound in the composition has already been absorbed before removal of the composition, the absorbed IRM compound would necessarily provide continued immune enhancement even after removal from contact.

Applicants argued that a removable vaginal device in normal usage delivered drug to the vaginal canal, which is intended, but not intended to remove the delivered drug from the mucosal surface when the sponge is removed. In response to this argument, whether it is intended or not,

the unabsorbed residual drug in a device is necessarily removed from the mucosal surface when the device is removed since it is known that an excess amount of active pharmaceutical in a dosage for vaginal application is present to achieve a desired concentration to be released as evidenced by US patent 6,328,991. Also, US 2002/0058674 teaches that the IRM compound such as imiquimod in a cream formulation was applied to the cervix for eight hours ([0348]), which implicitly discloses the IRM compound is removed after eight hour. This is further evidenced by the teaching of US 2002/0058674 that the IRM compound such as imiquimod was vaginally applied and then the vagina was lavaged (rinsed) after about 6 hours ([0368] and [0369]), which means that the IRM compound is removed from vagina. The instant claim 8 recites the IRM is removed less than 8 hours after it is applied. Since US 2002/0058674 already teaches applying the IRM compound and then removing less than 8 hours after it is applied as claimed, removing at least 50 % by weight of the IRM would necessarily happen. In the absence of evidence that at least 50 % by weight of the IRM is not removed when they remove the IRM compound less than 8 hours after application as taught by the prior art reference, the claimed subject matter is deemed to fail to be patentably distinguishable over the state of the art as represented by the cited references. Since the Office does not have the facilities for preparing the claimed materials and comparing them with prior art inventions, the burden is on Applicant to show a novel or unobvious difference between the claimed method and the method of the prior art. See *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1977) and *In re Fitzgerald*, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980).

In response to the argument that the '674 actually teaches away from the invention by pointing out as a problem the potential for "wash away" of the IRM and also mentioning

problem with irritation, those problems are mentioned in the background section of the reference for supporting that there is a continuing need for improved delivery system and methods for topical application to provide the greatest therapeutic benefit from IRM compounds and that their invention is intended to improves such delivery system and methods. Thus, it does not teach away from the claimed invention since those problems are not related to the method of '674.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BONG-SOOK BAEK whose telephone number is 571-270-5863. The examiner can normally be reached 9:00-7:00 Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on 571-272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian-Yong S Kwon/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1614
Bbs

BONG-SOOK BAEK
Examiner, Art Unit 1614